

History of Dogma, is surpassed in popularity by his brilliant lectures, given almost extempore, on "What is Christianity?"

It is a significant and a rather melancholy story that when a young German theologian was asked the other day by an Englishman what was the present position of von Harnack in Germany, the answer was: "We have conducted him to Olympus, from which he looks upon a world which knows him no more." It is an essential part of our present subject to consider why the Liberal Protestantism of Germany, which thirty years ago enjoyed a prestige commensurate with the vast learning and intellectual candour of its chief exponents, should now be so much under a cloud even in the land of its origin.

When we read Harnack's famous lectures already referred to, we find that he regards as the leading features of Jesus' message (1) the kingdom of God and its coming, (2) God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul, (3) the higher righteousness and the commandment of love. "Christianity had a founder who was himself what he taught. To steep ourselves in him is still the chief matter; but to restrict ourselves to him means to take a point of view too low for his significance. Individual religious life was what he wanted to kindle and did kindle; it is his peculiar greatness to have led men to God, so that they may thenceforth live their own life with him." The Gospels, though disfigured by miraculous stories which cannot be historical, offer us a plain picture of Christ's teaching; they tell us how His life issued in the service of His vocation; and they describe to us the impression which He made upon His disciples.

The "kingdom" is a gift from above; it is a purely religious blessing, the link with a living God; it dominates a man's whole existence, because sin is forgiven and misery banished.

The Gospel is not a positive religion; it is religion itself. It is the Fatherhood of God applied to the whole of life, a joyous certainty of the possession of eternal blessings. It is a transvaluation of all values, to which Christ first gives a calm and fearless expression.

The connection between ethics and external forms of worship is severed. Love and mercy are ends in themselves; nothing else has any value.

The three enemies of the higher life are mammon, anxiety, and selfishness. The Gospel of Christ is a Gospel of spiritual regeneration, not of social reform; but the warnings to the rich are very severe, and the call to embrace voluntary poverty would have been addressed to many in our time. "My kingdom is not of this world"; the Gospel is above all questions of mundane development; it is concerned, not with material things, but with the souls of men.

The overwhelming impression made by Christ on His disciples is an historical fact. And yet His words were not treasured with all the care that we should have expected; the living Spirit of God is the oracle of the early Christians. (Here Harnack almost disingenuously suppresses the Pauline doctrine of mystical union with *Christ*. One of the worst defects of the Ritschlian theology is thus apparent in this independent member of his school.)

"The greatest transformation that Christianity ever underwent falls in the second century," when a great ecclesiastical and political community spreads over the Empire, in which God is honoured with a solemn ritual, in which there is a sharp difference between priest and layman, and the living faith seems to be transformed into a creed to be believed. "Greek philosophy began to effect an entrance about the year 130." (This, again, is a very strange error; the influence of Greek thought, which in Philo has transformed Judaism, is easily traced in St. Paul, in the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the Fourth Evangelist.) "The proposition that the Logos had appeared among men had an intoxicating effect, but it did not lead with any certainty to the God whom Jesus Christ proclaimed." "Hellenism, with all the mysteries and the philosophy of Eastern worship, elements the most sublime and the most absurd, spun into a glittering web of allegorical interpretation, now fell upon the Christian religion." "The struggle with Gnosticism compelled the Church to put its teaching, worship, and discipline into fixed forms and ordinances, and to exclude all who would not yield them obedience." Henceforth the Spirit is confined within the narrowest limits; the Christian never loses his dependence on doctrine, on priest, on public worship, on the book. So originated the specifically Catholic form of godliness. Intellectualism has clung to the Christian religion ever

since, and institutionalism strangles freedom. But this stifling process came gradually; the Alexandrians and Tertullian still lived by the Gospel.

Greek Catholicism made an end of polytheism, but "it takes the form, not of a Christian product in Greek dress, but of a Greek product in Christian dress." "It is a continuation of the history of Greek religion under the alien influence of Christianity"; but its fanaticism for orthodoxy is not Greek. "Its notion of redemption as a deification of mortal nature is sub-Christian, because the moral element can only be tacked to it, and because it has scarcely any connection with the Christ of the Gospel, and leads away from him." "It is the religion of the ancient world, tacked on to certain conceptions in the Gospel."

The three ingredients of Roman Catholicism, according to Harnack, are the Catholicism (in the sense defined above) which it shares with the Greek Church, the spirit of the Roman world-empire, and the Augustinian theology. These three constitute the peculiar character of the Roman Church. Legalism pervades the whole structure. The "mysteries" have become "sacraments"—binding acts and carefully limited gifts of grace. All that was Roman in the dying Western Empire took refuge within the Church. The Roman Church is the actual continuation of the Roman Empire, the influence of which may be traced in every detail. The "*Pontifex Maximus*" is Cæsar's successor. "It is an Empire that this priestly Cæsar rules, and to attack it with the argument of dogmatic polemics alone is to beat the air." Outside the corporation there is no salvation. Infallibility means simply autocratic sovereignty. It is no contradiction that under this iron rule there is room for much politic flexibility.

Roman Catholicism, then, belongs to Roman history; it has no foundation in the Gospel. It is the possession of the Latin nations, which Harnack, a German writing before the war, most erroneously supposed to have no great future. And yet it must be admitted, he adds, that this Church "still produces saints."

Protestantism, he says, "reduced" the Gospel to "its essential factors, the Word of God and Faith." Faith, for Luther, was "the confident belief in the God of grace." The Protestant Church is not an invisible community, but a com-

munity of the Spirit, the visibility of which takes different forms. "Protestantism reckons on the Gospel being something so simple, so divine, and therefore so truly human, as to be most certain of being understood when it is left entirely free, and also so as to produce essentially the same experiences and convictions in individual souls." "Our Church is not the particular Church in which we are placed, but the *societas fidei*, which has its members everywhere, even among the Greeks and Romans." Protestantism rejects the entire hierarchical system of Catholicism; it rejects all formal, external authority in religion; all ritualism, and every sort of "holy work"; all sacramentalism; the double form of morality; and the idea that some kinds of activity are more sacred than others. Religion, for the Protestant, is meant to pervade all things, and must itself be freed from whatever is external to it.

This brief summary of a remarkable book will suffice to show what Liberal Protestantism lately was in Germany. The massive learning of Harnack and others gave it great authority in England, but I do not think it ever determined the course of Liberal theology in this country. It was stamped too strongly with Lutheran ideas, for example on the nature of faith, and with the peculiar development of Lutheranism associated with the name of Ritschl. It is now a waning influence, and it will be worth while to consider how far its decline is caused by inherent defects, and how far we must admit that there has been a real reversion among us to another type of religion.

To begin with, the theory of a primitive Lutheranism overlaid by Hellenism is untrue. There never was a Christian Church in Europe unaffected by Greek thought. St. Paul himself was a "Grecian"; he was converted, as I have said before, to the Christianity of Stephen, whose heroic martyrdom he had witnessed. The Catholic Church was from the first Hellenistic. Troeltsch saw the truth much more clearly than Harnack when he said, in words which I have already quoted, that the Church was the last creative achievement of classical civilisation, which may be said to have died in giving birth to it. This anti-Hellenic prejudice warps the whole theology of German Liberal Protestantism. The fusion of the Gospel with European civilisation was so

intimate that the two can never be torn asunder, and began so early that the Greek element in Christianity cannot be treated as an alien accretion. There was no breach of continuity when the empire became Christian.

The statement of some among the younger critics that St. Paul inaugurated the cult of the *Kyrios Christos*, and thereby changed Christianity into a mystery religion of a type very familiar to the Græco-Roman world, is no doubt exaggerated. The Church would make no terms with the Pagan mystery-cults, and regarded them as hostile to itself, if not diabolical. But even this exaggeration is nearer the truth than to suppose that the early Church revered in Jesus only the Teacher of the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of man. The doctrine of the mystical union of the Christian with the glorified and indwelling Christ was the core of St. Paul's religion, and the belief that this union is strengthened and effectuated through sacraments was already held by St. Paul, though assuredly not in a superstitious and unethical form.

Harnack's conception of faith, which is Luther's, falls far short, in penetration and spiritual depth, of the fine teaching of Clement of Alexandria and other Greek divines.

Lastly, it has been said that Ritschl has no eschatology; and this defect may be discerned in Harnack also.

The polemic of Loisy against Harnack brings out other points of difference. Loisy strikes at the heart of Liberal Protestantism. In place of a history of the Church which is mainly a record of decline and corruption, he insists on the historical necessity which made Catholicism develop as it has developed. "If you want to prove the identity of a man with a child, you do not try to force him again into his cradle." Assuming that Christ meant His Church to live and grow, it had to live and grow in a certain way, the way that it chose, or which necessity chose for it. The Christ of Liberal Protestantism, the French critic declares, is an artificial and impossible figure draped in the costume of the nineteenth century. The actual Jesus was an apocalyptic prophet, who taught His disciples to believe in a rapidly approaching end of the world, within the lifetime of most of them. This was the heart of His message; His ethical teaching was of subordinate importance, and was

coloured by His erroneous belief in an approaching supernatural catastrophe. The Jesus of the Gospel and the Christ of the Church are "*comme deux Christs*." The "reduced Christianity" of Liberalism is a halfway house, with no scientific value. It is better, he argues, to recognise that the Christ of the Church's worship was created by the faith and love of the early Christians. A creed is not a flat historical recital, but a poetical and symbolic representation of what faith finds in the objects of its contemplation.

Thus Loisy's Modernism separates truths of fact from truths of faith. Its negative historical criticism is far more drastic than that of the majority of Liberals; but by means of a philosophy akin to pragmatism it restores with one hand all that it has taken away with the other. Where the Liberal speaks of "traditionalism" as the enemy, the Modernist speaks of "intellectualism." Faith, as we have found some of the younger members of the school declaring, is fundamentally "irrational."

There can be no doubt that the present century has witnessed a widespread revolt against the domination of natural science, with its tendency to a mechanical interpretation of all existence. Several influences from diverse sides have converged to produce this result. There has been a great recrudescence of superstition, a tendency to believe in miracles, and to adopt a philosophy which will justify both credulity and scepticism. There has also been an increase of herd-contagion, which prompts people to talk of "the revival of the corporate idea," and to disparage what they call individualism. This movement has been accentuated by the disasters of the last fourteen years. All these concurrent influences have tended to depress Protestantism, and to encourage a rather superficial but sometimes enthusiastic Neo-Catholicism. Every defeat of civilisation, every set-back to science, is a victory for Roman Catholicism, which is fundamentally hostile to modern ideas. The rejection of "intellectualism" is especially welcome to the half-educated, who in democratic countries set the tone to society generally. It is for the half-educated that newspapers, authors, politicians, and Churchmen alike must cater. The "intellectuals" must beware, for they are very few.

Whether the intellectual and moral frivolity of the last ten

years will continue it is difficult to say, and prophecy, whether optimistic or the reverse, is no part of the plan of this little book. My object in summarising the historical developments of Protestantism has been to help us to disengage the accidental and temporary from the essential and permanent elements in Protestantism. I shall not attempt to predict its future, which must depend on the condition of European and American civilisation. There is no reason whatever to suppose that the more rational, moral, and spiritual type of religion will prevail over the more superstitious, unethical, and materialistic, unless civilisation generally is progressing towards a higher type. A decadent race will have a decadent religion; and Catholicism, which has already provided a euthanasia for one moribund civilisation, may easily perform the same office for another. My sole object in the concluding section which follows will be to determine in broad outlines what the Protestant type of Christianity is, when cleared of the extraneous elements which have modified its action in the existing Protestant Churches.

THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY

WHEN Sabatier contrasted Protestantism, as the religion of the Spirit, with Catholicism as the chief religion of authority, he was accused by Catholics of opposing two things which are by no means incompatible with each other. If the characteristic of a saint is to be spiritually minded, can any other form of Christianity, it has been asked, show so noble and beautiful an array of saints as the Catholic Church? Would it not even be possible to argue that a certain lack of spirituality has characterised the virtues of Protestantism? The objection shows, perhaps, that the antithesis has not been correctly stated. The question is not so much whether reliance on authority is compatible with spirituality as whether the attitude of Catholics towards an authority external to the individual is not a negation of the freedom which in St. Paul, for example, belongs to the spiritual man, who judges all things and is judged of no man. We have seen that there are four possible courts of appeal—the institutional Church, speaking either through tradition or through the mouths of its constituted rulers; the Holy Scrip-

tures; the inner light, regarded as the illumination of the mind by the Spirit of God; and human reason, which includes both philosophy and the verdicts of science and criticism. No body of Christians rests exclusively on any one of the four, or entirely excludes any one of the four. But whereas the Catholic regards the voice of the Church as infallible, and not to be questioned without disloyalty, and while the Protestantism of the Reformation period gives much the same absoluteness to the revelation of God's will in the inspired Word, the spirit of Protestantism, when it understands itself, holds that there is no infallible authority anywhere, but that men are educated both by what Dean Church called the gifts of civilisation, and by the Holy Spirit, whose operations are now often called religious experience. Modern Protestantism gives decidedly greater authority to the internal witnesses, the mystical experience and reason, than to either of the two external guides. In so doing it believes that it is true to the original Gospel. Now here we have a cleavage between Catholicism and Protestantism which can never be bridged over. Mr. Fawkes quotes two passages which illustrate the contrast. Mark Pattison says: "Those rites and doctrines which have made most noise in the Romanist controversy are those which are the least of the essence of Romanism. The Virgin and the Saints, Reliques, Images, Purgatory, and Masses—these by-words with the vulgar and the unthinking are powerless decorations or natural developments." (The inclusion of the Mass in this list is certainly a mistake. I have shown in the course of this sketch how supremely important the Sacraments are in the Catholic scheme.) "The one essential principle of the Catholic system is the control of the individual conscience by an authority or law placed without it and exercised over it by men assuming to act in the name of Heaven." On the page before Mr. Fawkes quotes a passage from Bishop Gore, which proves not only how congenial the idea of submission and obedience is to the natural Catholic, but how ready a Catholic is to read this kind of authority into the New Testament, where it is to be found only in that very typical ecclesiastic, the High Priest Caiaphas. "The New Testament presents us with a picture, which later Church history only elaborates, of a corporate body legis-

lating for its members with a divine sanction. The normal Christian is a man under authority—the authority of the body he belongs to. In his whole life he ought to feel this corporate authority, and he ought to recognise in detail the precepts of the Church.” To which the typical Protestant will reply indignantly that this is precisely the way in which a powerful institutional Church always “quenches the Spirit,” “despises prophesyings,” and strangles every attempt to put new life into dry bones.

There is, however, one qualification which must be made before we identify Protestantism with complete freedom from authority. Protestantism stands or falls by the historical revelation made nearly two thousand years ago in the person and the work of the Redeemer. It is bound up with certain historical events as closely as orthodox Romanism, and much more closely than Catholic Modernism. The Protestant is often twitted with inconsistency on this very ground, and there have been some Protestants who envy the Modernists their independence of a historical record, which, like all other historical records, may possibly be untrustworthy in parts. To rest the truth of religion on certain historical occurrences may seem contrary to the whole attitude of Protestantism, and may be suspected of being a mere survival from “the religions of authority.” So far as I can see, this objection is valid against some developments of Protestantism, but not against the Christology of St. Paul. We cannot cut the link between the indwelling “Spirit of Christ” and the historical Jesus of Nazareth without altering the type of our religion. It must be said plainly that the Protestant chooses not to be invulnerable on this side. In the Person of Christ he recognises an absolute Authority, though that Authority is not a dead hand, but a quickening Spirit. *Conversio fit ad Dominum ut Spiritum.*

INSTITUTIONALISM

TOGETHER with the revival of interest in mysticism, based on a new and fruitful scientific study of the psychology of religious belief, there has been, ever since the Romanticist movement, a tendency to emphasise what is called the corporate idea, the idea of loyalty to the institutional Church.

This has been represented as the religious form of Socialism, though in truth it has more in common with Syndicalism. Aubrey Moore, one of the ablest of the *Lux Mundi* school, writing in 1889, saw in it an abandonment of the "individualism" of the industrial revolution, and of the "atomistic" natural philosophy which accompanied it. Those who had been brought up in these traditions were, he says exultingly, bewildered by the sight of "men in the nineteenth century actually expressing a belief in a divine society and a supernatural presence in our midst, a brotherhood in which men become members of an organic whole by sharing in a common life, a service of man which is the natural and spontaneous outcome of the service of God." Other writers, studying the history of religions in a more detached manner, have come to the conclusion that religion is essentially a social, not a private affair, and that, as Troeltsch says, "the essence of religion is not dogma and idea, but cultus and communion, an intercourse of the entire community." Royce in his last important work emphasised the same view, finding the centre of Christianity in "loyalty to the beloved community." "Such a community is an indispensable means of salvation for the individual man, and is the fitting realm wherein alone the kingdom of heaven which the Master preached can find its expression." Such words would be rigorous in the mouth of an Ultramontane; they are much more astonishing and significant as coming from a non-Catholic, who refuses to identify the ideal community with any existing Church. All these writers, and many others who might be cited, seem to agree with Cyprian that to be a Christian means to be an enthusiastic Churchman. This is a view which no Protestant can accept.

On the other side, we have Swinburne declaring that he could accept the Crucified if He came without His "leprous bride," the Church. And when we consider the record of the Great Church in history, our condemnation of the much-lauded "corporate idea" in action is likely to be very severe. The great crime of Catholicism has been its claim to a monopoly of divine grace, a claim fundamentally unchristian, and in practice a justification of such fraud and callous cruelty as no other political organi-

sation has ever been guilty of. Catholicism has attempted to win the masses by pandering to the grossest superstitions, and by the most materialistic promises and threats. Even Cardinal Newman admits that "a popular religion is always a corrupt religion"; and George Tyrrell, in reply to the plea that Catholicism appeals to the multitude, says: "Could not the same be said of some of the worst religions of the world? Are not these mediocre millions the easy and natural prey of a priestly caste, with its usual promises of cheap salvation by unspiritual external methods? It is not in having the poor with it, but in doing them good, that a religion is proved to be Christ's. What if it keep them poor, or make them poorer, or foster their ignorance and moral degradation? The real question is, What does Catholicism do for the moral and spiritual elevation of the degraded? It is not enough to get them to go through a routine of religious duties if there be no moral redemption." It is no wonder that the author of these embarrassing questions was adjudged to be a bad Catholic, and condemned to be buried like a dog. The well-disciplined Roman Catholic Churchman allows no such scruples to cramp his style. *Melius est ut unus pereat quam unitas*. Let the innocent Dreyfus die in prison; let the Irishman who has committed a treacherous murder be told to leave "politics" out of his confession; let the lucrative imposture of Lourdes be encouraged by the Curia itself; let the Greek Orthodox Church be handed over without protest to wholesale spoliation and massacre by Turks and Bolsheviks. The logic of institutionalism is inexorable. Given the Roman monopolist claim, and all these things will be done, and not inconsistently.

To the Protestant the question is quite plainly between Christ, who said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and the Machiavellian ethics of Roman imperialism. The tree is known by its fruits, and the fruits of Catholic institutionalism are proved to be poisonous. A Church which has no other "interests" except the highest welfare of the people who worship, or even who refuse to worship, in its temples will not be able to make concordats with Governments; it will form no "Centre party" to make bargains with politicians and extort concessions from them; it will organise no

ingenious apparatus for extracting money from the faithful; it will encourage rather than obstruct secular education, and will not try to turn little children into finished bigots. By numerical and democratic standards it will be a failure and a mark for derision. But it will be like the leaven which is hid in three measures of meal, till the whole is leavened.

SECULARITY AND OTHER-WORLDLINESS

HERE the record of Protestantism has been ambiguous. Catholicism, by turning spiritual hopes and fears into very concrete and vivid pictures of enjoyment and torture, managed, by means of these irreligious appeals, to exercise some influence upon the irreligious majority. Protestantism has, unhappily, not been behindhand in following the same tactics. Nemesis has now fallen upon both branches of Christendom alike in the general incredulity about human immortality in any sense. The Churches have so vulgarised and misused "the blessed hope of everlasting life" that they have nearly killed it. Secularity, provoked by these illegitimate bribes and menaces, is the great enemy which threatens Christianity in all its branches.

Socialism is the modern form of Millenarianism, and sometimes enlists in its service a quasi-religious enthusiasm. There are striking resemblances between the Bolsheviks and the Jesuits. But there is a real problem as to what should be the attitude of the Church of Christ towards social reform. It is a modern problem, which hardly agitated the medieval Church, and in the Reformation period came to the front chiefly among the sectaries.

The policy of Rome is to condemn Communism, which is radically anti-religious and, a Catholic would say, contrary to the Law of Nature, but to show sympathy with Labour movements, if the Church can get anything out of them. Catholicism dislikes the middle class, which in religion is democratic and independent. Protestants are as much divided on political questions as any other large body of citizens drawn from all classes. There is a decided tendency, both in the Anglican Church and in the Free Churches, to secularise the Christian message, and to repudiate St. Paul's saying that "if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of

all men most miserable." It is sometimes alleged that Anglicanism is the religion of the "respectable" classes, and therefore prone to Conservatism; the Anglo-Catholic party is eager to prove that this charge is no longer true. There is a good deal of competition for court chaplaincies to King Demos. This conversion of the clergy to Socialism would have been more impressive if it had come before universal suffrage. The real danger is of secularity, taking refuge in politicism. A Church which has gone into politics, on either side, is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden underfoot of men.

The ironies of history are colossal, and support von Eicken's contention that all institutions tend to develop into their opposites. The Catholic Church, which in the name of the Master offered a patient, heroic, and purely passive resistance to the persecuting secular power, issued in the arrogant pretensions of a Hildebrand. Puritanism, which with equal sincerity preached the sinfulness of all self-indulgent expenditure, ended in producing the magnates of the great American Trusts. Rightly considered, these two examples show how ready the devil is to capture the organisations formed to defeat him. When he has succeeded, he never changes the labels.

PROTESTANTISM AND SCIENCE

In spite of the reaction against mechanistic materialism which has been apparent in our generation, in spite also of the profound doubts and fundamental difficulties which are beginning to agitate the calm waters of scientific research, there is not the slightest sign of that "bankruptcy of science" of which the Neo-Catholic Brunetière spoke too confidently. Within the ranks of scientific investigators there is no loss of faith, but an abounding confidence and enthusiasm. In an age of disillusionment and cynicism, when many are saying "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," the atmosphere which plays about nature-study, thin but bracing like the air of mountain-tops, remains clear, sunny, and health-giving. Nor must we give much importance to such absurd outbreaks of belated obscurantism as that of the American "Fundamentalists," which illustrate only the extreme bar-

barism of some strata of society in the United States. Such coteries have always existed; they are now vocal; they were formerly silent. But the spread of education, and still more the acquaintance with machinery which is now becoming general, are steadily implanting in the popular mind the scientific way of looking at the world, and eradicating the last traces of that supernaturalistic dualism which was and is the philosophy of Catholicism. Science is the purgatory of religion, and of politics. Recrudescences of spiritualism, faith-healing, necromancy, and other superstitions show undoubtedly that the craving for miracle dies hard. "Miracle," said a German thinker, "is the dearest child of faith." But the current still flows steadily towards the scientific view of the world-order. Even Catholicism is more chary of calling attention to its cherished miracles, except in dealing with minds which desire them. That such exist is shown by a letter received a few days ago from a recent "convert." "What other Church," she asked me, "can show such miracles as the liquefying blood of St. Januarius, the healings at Lourdes, and the flying house of Loreto?"

Now Protestantism, when once free from Bibliolatry, can come to terms with modern science in a way impossible to Romanism. An entente between these two old enemies would necessitate some bold changes both in creed and conduct; but these changes would leave the vital part of Protestantism untouched. The Roman Church has declared that there can be no reconciliation between Rome and modern Liberalism or Progress; Protestantism is entirely free from this uncompromising preference for the Dark Ages. It is in this direction that Protestants may look for the beginning of what may really be a new Reformation, a resumption of the unfinished work of Sir Thomas More, Giordano Bruno, and Erasmus.

PROSE AND POETRY

PROTESTANTISM is very inferior to Catholicism in its knowledge of human nature. The typical Protestant, if he is religious at all, communes alone with God in a Holy of Holies from which all that is frivolous, light, and merely pretty is excluded. "A man's religion," says Hocking, "is the hiddenest thing in him." Or, with Whitehead, "a man's

religion is the way he spends his solitude." The Catholic is halfway to the Hindoo, who, it has been said, eats, drinks, washes, and *sins* religiously and sociably. Religion is not always a very serious or moral affair; indeed, some religions are thoroughly bad things. But the Protestant, in his preoccupation with ethics, undervalues the æsthetic side of life, and thereby loses the sympathy of most persons who have the artistic temperament. Poetry plays a much larger part in life than the Protestant is willing to admit. For him a myth must be a hard fact or a wicked lie; sacramental symbolism is fraudulent magic; all the pretty world of half-belief which the Catholic imagination spreads between the self and hard reality must be swept away ruthlessly. And not being very clear-headed, the typical Protestant after all keeps something which belongs to the discredited class of opinions. This is really a difficult problem. Concessions are dangerous, as we have seen in the Anglican Church; and yet it is a pity to alienate a large number of men, and a much larger number of women, because we distrust the expression of religious emotion by appeals to the eye. There is nothing necessarily degrading in such symbolism. God speaks to the soul without language and without form. The language and the form are ours, but we have a right to be intelligible to ourselves, and we need not be afraid of warmth and colour.

PROTESTANTISM STILL IN THE MAKING

SANTAYANA, in his brilliant volume, *Reason in Religion*, has a satirical account of the Protestant Churches, the defects of which are sure to be apparent to a thinker of Spanish origin. He hits the mark when he says that the nations of Northern Europe are still intellectually and spiritually immature as compared with the Latin races, who have had a much longer experience. The northern barbarians accepted from their civilised neighbours the Mediterranean religion in its Christian form, though it was far from really suiting them. Catholicism, says Santayana, was "the last sigh of two dying civilisations"; it was "post-rational," world-renouncing, and ascetic. The Northern Europeans, on the contrary, were adventurous, chivalrous, aggressive, and confident of the future; thoughtful and moral, but childlike in their in-

experience of civilised life. They never understood either the original Gospel or the old religions of the Roman Empire which helped to make that curious amalgam, the Catholic Church. They transformed what they took, introducing, for example, the code of chivalry into Christianity, and were unconscious of that large portion of the Catholic tradition which was unintelligible to them. Without subscribing to this view of Catholicism as a creed of resignation and apathy, which seems to me only half true, I think Santayana is right in saying that Protestantism has not yet fully found itself. In the forms which it has taken hitherto it is scarcely worthy of the vigorous nations in which it has been the dominant faith. There has been a confusion in the spiritual life of the Western peoples, a want of clarity in estimating the values of life, a lack of disciplined thought which has often made the struggles of Protestantism against Catholicism like the tactics and strategy of untrained troops. There is also, at least in England and the United States, downright silliness in many of the religious fads and crazes which find adherents, to which there is no parallel in Southern Europe. To erect Anglo-Israelitism, prohibition of alcohol, and prohibition of tobacco ("Worship the Lord with clean lips!") into religious dogmas shows a very crude mentality.

Nevertheless, these are the vagaries of a young and half-formed civilisation rather than symptoms of senile decay. I have renounced any intention of predicting what forms Protestant Christianity will take in the future. Three things only may be asserted with some confidence. Firstly, the Christianity of Northern Europe and North America has still a long and vigorous career before it; it will certainly recover from its present depression. Secondly, it must undergo great changes; there can be no return to Luther and Calvin. And, thirdly, it will not end by subjecting itself again to Latin Christianity, which is even more antipathetic to its deepest instincts than when it threw off the yoke of Rome four hundred years ago.

BENN'S SIXPENNY LIBRARY

EDITED BY WILLIAM ROSE, M.A., Ph.D.

ALREADY PUBLISHED

- No.
1. A HISTORY OF ENGLAND by D. C. Somervell.
 2. WORLD OF GREECE AND ROME by Edwyn Bevan.
 4. ROMAN BRITAIN by Gordon Home.
 12. A HISTORY OF RUSSIA by Prince Mirsky.
 15. A HISTORY OF CHINA by Professor Soothill.
 16. THE PAPACY by A. L. Maycock.
 18. A HISTORY OF INDIA by Edward Thompson.
 51. ENGLISH LITERATURE by Professor C. H. Herford.
 52. FRENCH LITERATURE by Maurice Baring.
 53. ITALIAN LITERATURE by Professor E. G. Gardner.
 54. SHAKESPEARE by G. B. Harrison.
 56. RUSSIAN LITERATURE by Professor J. Lavrin.
 59. MYTHS OF GREECE AND ROME by Jane Harrison.
 87. THE ENGLISH NOVEL by J. B. Priestley.
 101. MODERN SCIENTIFIC IDEAS by Sir Oliver Lodge.
 102. THE AGE OF THE EARTH by Professor Arthur Holmes.
 103. THE ATOM by Professor E. N. da C. Andrade.
 104. CHEMISTRY by Percy E. Spielmann.
 105. RELATIVITY by James Rice.
 106. THE EARTH, SUN AND MOON by Professor G. Forbes.
 107. THE STARS by Professor G. Forbes.
 113. RACES OF MANKIND by Professor H. J. Fleure.
 114. MAN IN THE MAKING by R. R. Marett.
 140. SIR ISAAC NEWTON by V. E. Pullin.
 141. THE BODY by Dr. R. C. Macfie.
 145. THE WEATHER by C. E. P. Brooks.
 151. RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD by Rev. C. C. Martindale.
 152. THE MIND AND ITS WORKINGS by C. E. M. Joad.
 161. DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL IDEAS by F. J. C. Hearnshaw.
 165. THE LIFE OF CHRIST by Dr. R. J. Campbell.
 166. CATHOLICISM by Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J.
 167. PROTESTANTISM by Dean Inge.
 177. TRADE by Sir Ernest J. P. Benn.
 179. MONEY by Hartley Withers.
 251. NELSON by Major-General Sir George Aston.
 252. OLIVER CROMWELL by Hilaire Belloc.

FURTHER TITLES

13. HISTORY OF ITALY by Mrs. G. M. Trevelyan.
19. ISLÁM by Sir E. Denison Ross.
70. ENGLISH POETRY by John Drinkwater.
109. EVOLUTION by Professor E. W. Macbride.
110. HEREDITY by F. A. Crew.
117. INTRODUCTION TO BIOLOGY by Professor Dakin.
143. THE STRUCTURE OF MATTER by Dr. W. A. Caspari.
153. PSYCHO-ANALYSIS by Ernest Jones.
170. EDUCATIONAL THEORIES by Sir John Adams.
175. INTRODUCTION TO ECONOMICS by Lionel Robbins.